

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

No amendments are submitted with this response.

In the Applicant's response of November 24, 2009, responding to the Decision of Appeal of September 28, 2009, the Applicant presented claim amendments, of which claim 1 is representative for the purposes of this argument.

The Examiner has maintained the original rejection that claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-13, 15-18, and 26 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,672 to Hartmaier ("Hartmaier") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,577 to Jackson ("Jackson"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,761 to LaPierre ("LaPierre"). The Examiner's rejections have been carefully considered but are respectfully traversed for the reason that the cited references do not show the features added to claim 1 in the previous amendments.

Claim 1 was amended to recite routing the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers associated with respective wireless devices capable of inbound and outbound communications. Claim 1 was further amended to recite that the telephony interface connects the call to a user by connecting the first communication path to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by receipt of an acknowledgement signal.

At page 4 of the Office Action of January 25, 2010, the Examiner alleges that Jackson teaches routing the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers associated with respective wireless devices capable of inbound and outbound communications. The Examiner points to items 18 and 20 of Jackson in this regard. Items 18 and 20 of Jackson are a wireless telephone 18 and a pager 20. The cited portions of Jackson do not disclose or suggest that the devices 18 and 20 are capable of inbound and outbound communications, as claimed. Even if it is assumed that wireless telephone 18 is capable of inbound and outbound communications, it is submitted that pagers are well known to those skilled in the relevant arts as being devices that receive signals only. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Jackson fails to teach or

suggest at least two wireless destination telephone numbers associated with respective wireless devices capable of inbound and outbound communications, as claimed.

Further, the Examiner points to column 3, lines 12-24 and 55-58 of Jackson with respect to the claimed connecting the call to a user by connecting said first communication path to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by receipt of an acknowledgement signal. The Examiner then states that it is well known in the art that when a call is answered, it is acknowledged by the system. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. It is submitted that the Examiner's statement that this feature is simply "well known" without producing a relevant, citeable prior art reference showing this feature leaves the Applicant in the untenable position of having to respond to a rejection to which no basis is provided.

First, the claim language does not simply recite an acknowledgement signal. Rather, the claim language recites that communication path is authenticated by receipt of an acknowledgement signal. Jackson does not teach or suggest authenticating a communication path by receipt of an acknowledgement signal, nor do the cited portions of Jackson teach or suggest an acknowledgement signal. The Examiner is respectfully requested to either produce a relevant, citable prior art reference showing a communication path authenticated by receipt of an acknowledgement signal, as claimed, or withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner further rejects claims 19-23, 25, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Haertmaier, in view of Jackson, and in further view of LaPierre, and yet in even further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,191 to Karpus ("Karpus").

In Applicant's response of November 24, 2009, claim 29 was amended to recite that the enterprise telecommunication network consists solely of wireless devices capable of inbound and outbound communications. A similar amendment was made to claim 19. In the Examiner's rejection found at pages 11-14 of the Office Action of January 25, 2010, the Examiner does not appear to allege that the cited references teach this newly added claim feature. If the Examiner therefore views claims 19 and 29 as being allowable, the Applicant would appreciate receiving an indication as such.

It is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Hartmaier, Jackson, and/or LaPierre because the references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features recited by claim 1. Independent claims 19, 26, and 29 recite similar features and are patentable for the same reasons. The dependent claims depend from claims 1, 19, 26, or 29 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Applicant is concerned to advance this application as quickly as is reasonably possible. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that, in the event the Examiner has any further questions about this application, the Examiner call Applicant's attorney at the number provided below.

Applicant believes that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper. In the event that the office determines that any fee is due, Appellant requests that such fee be charged to its Deposit Account No. 195113.

Applicant requests that any questions concerning this matter be directed to the undersigned at 416-216-4020.

Respectfully submitted,

**OGILVY RENAULT LLP**

Date: April 20, 2010

By                     /mve/                      
Michael Van Ecsbeek  
Registration No. 61,951  
Telephone (416) 216-4020  
Fax (216) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP  
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower  
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84  
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2Z4  
Canada